DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 370 HE 019 869

AUTHOR Dowling, Noreen
TITLE Motivation and the Role of Faculty in Public Service in the University of California.
PUB DATE 18 Sep 86
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the International Meeting of Urban Universities of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, September 18, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; College Instruction; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Public Policy; *Public Service; *Research Projects; Rewards; School Community Relationship; *State Universities; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Participation; Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *University of California

ABSTRACT

The participation of the University of California (UC) in public service is discussed, along with the role of faculty in public service and motivations and rewards needed to promote involvement. Public service at UC is defined as the extension of research, teaching, and professional expertise of faculty members for the benefit of the community and the larger society. Directed at nonuniversity audiences, it is normally, but not necessarily, uncompensated. Public service is generally marginal but sometimes a significant factor in the advancement of UC faculty. Components of the university that are involved in public service include cooperative extension, university extension, two national laboratories, organized research units, and two special programs: the Public Service Research and Dissemination Program and the California Policy Seminar. Structures that facilitate public service are considered, along with faculty attitudes toward public policy involvement, and characteristics of faculty who participate in public service. It is concluded that the university benefits by improved public image and awareness of public policy issues. Faculty benefit from stimulating contacts and application to practical problems, and students and the curriculum can also benefit from new applications of theory as applied to current issues. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276370

MOTIVATION AND THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Presentation at the

International Meeting of Urban Universities

University of Winnipeg, Canada

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

September 18, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Noreen Dowling
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Noreen Dowling
Director
Public Service Research and Dissemination Program
University of California
Davis, California 95616

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 019 869

TO BE PUBLISHED BY THE INSTITUTE OF URBAN STUDIES,
UNIVERSITY OF WINNIPEG

MOTIVATION AND THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN PUBLIC SERVICE IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

For well over one hundred years now federal and state governments have looked to universities to assist them and citizens in understanding new scientific and technical developments as well as major societal changes. Agricultural development has depended on land grant university involvement to meet the demands of changing technology and to improve genetic breeding for the production of food and fiber. Most recently the computer and biotechnology industries have a somewhat similar intimate relationship with universities.

The 1960's were characterized by student challenges to urban and international issues, which drew higher education into the caldron of political process and change, often alienating those in power. By the mid seventies several universities, among them Wayne State University, University of Maryland, and Pennsylvania State University, initiated programs which encouraged faculty to contribute to policy issues which would benefit state and local government, and reestablish credibility of collegiate institutions as state and national resources.

Another of those institutions, the University of California, will be discussed as an example of a research institutions' participation in public service. UC is a nine campus, plus two national laboratory, multiversity located in five cities and six smaller communities. As such it includes agricultural as well as urban influences. On three campuses

the land grant elements of the university exist side by side with basic disciplines and professional schools. Cooperative Extension, part of the university, serves all 58 counties of the state, with specialists on three campuses. Self supporting University Extension is part of each campus and specializes in professional continuing education. These elements provide part of the institutional image of the university as a provider of public service.

Public service can be understood in terms of institutional responses to the public need or in terms of the contributions of individuals who are significant members of the institution. The University realized that the expertise of the faculty, as contributors to public issues, was critical to reestablish public confidence in the institution. In this discussion I refer specifically to the role of the <u>faculty</u> in public service and what has been learned about motivations and rewards needed to effectively involve members of different colleges and schools.

A definition of public service was recently developed on our campus by members of the Academic Senate Committee on Public Service in order to establish common language and understanding among the academic community.

> Public Service is the extension of research, teaching, and professional expertise of faculty members for the benefit of the community and the larger society. Directed at non-university audiences, it is normally--but not necessarily uncompensated.

The University of California charges all its faculty with the responsibility for teaching, research and professional activities/public service and university service. The Davis campus has made special effort, since 1984 to recognize public service "based upon a faculty member's research and professional expertise". The annual call for merits and promotions has these provisions:

1. "Meritorious" public service "should be considered a positive factor" in reviewing faculty for advancement.
2. Still, the lack of public service accomplishments is not "detrimental" to advancement--a recognition that the opportunity for such work in some fields is quite limited.
3. When evaluated, public service is not a substitute for research and teaching achievements; it is "complementary" to these other types of activities.
4. Public service (as other faculty achievements) should be documented in the review process, including an assessment of "quality and impact."

In sum, public service is generally marginal but sometimes a significant factor in the advancement of UC faculty. While not weighed equally to research and teaching, meritorious public service activities--especially if linked closely to the other two areas--can have a favorable impact on specific merit and promotion decisions.

Structures Which Facilitate Public Service

The public image of the university is characterized by some composite of the many elements of the institution. To many rural citizens Cooperative Extension is the university in their community and through it they have access to technical and occasionally policy information. Recently a Cooperative Extension Water Task Force has worked for about seven years to assist the diverse vested interests in water, form new coalitions which are beginning to reach agreement on a unified state water plan.

University Extension, a totally self supporting unit, is on each campus and is the primary continuing education vehicle for many professions in California. Certificates are offered which provide for professional upgrading in many fields. University Extension occasionally sponsors large public conferences on critical policy questions.

The two national laboratories, Lawrence Livermore and Los Alamos, are managed by the university and are heavily involved in defense and energy research. The academic community is very conscious of the role of the labs as a part of the university. There have been extensive debates over why the university should sponsor research for the destruction of humankind.

These previously mentioned institutional segments are staffed primarily by academic professionals who are not tenure-track faculty. These entities

INSTITUTIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE

Cooperative Extension

-- Specialists
-- Researchers
58 counties

University Extension

-- Academic programmers

2 National Laboratories

-- Staff scientists

are semi-autonomous organizations which provide a large segment of the university's public service role in society.

Another very significant set of academic structures beyond departments, are categorized as Organized Research Units (ORUs). They are funded in whole or part by institutional funds for the support of faculty projects and to receive funds for research from outside sources. Teich (1978), identifies two kinds, one the research institute to advance basic knowledge and the other the applied mission and problem solving type. In the University of California, all ORUs are interdisciplinary and are focused on important areas beyond one discipline. These become the locus of activity for faculty with common interests. The mission oriented ones usually have responsibility for contact with outside agencies and provide direct dissemination of information to the public through conferences, seminars, or publications.

There are about 130 such Organized Research Units in the UC system ranging from very small to very large, and unevenly distributed on campuses. About 22 of them are Systemwide and accessible to faculty of all campuses. Table 1 shows the spread of these units. Each of these organizations has its own funding level and reporting mechanism and there is no overall way to recognize the public service elements of these programs.

On two occasions in recent university history (1947 and 1974), all university conferences focused on the role of faculty in public service,

TABLE 1

ORGANIZED RESEARCH UNITS

22 Systemwide

--Faculty, including graduate researchers

Nine Campuses

40 - UC Berkeley

14 - UC Davis

7 - UC Irvine

29 - UC Los Angeles

4 - UC Riverside

19 - UC San Diego

10 - UC San Francisco

4 - UC Santa Barbara

3 - UC Santa Cruz

130 - TOTAL

Special Programs

California Policy Seminar, Systemwide]
]**Policy Research--State**
Public Service Research and Dissemination Program, UC Davis]

and the reasons for the poor visibility of public service. They recommended that there was a need for a structure to provide linkages and focus to the efforts which already exist.

In 1976 two special programs, neither of which are ORUs, arose almost simultaneously, to specifically address the problem of linkage and increase the responsiveness of the university through its faculty, to the needs of the state in time of crisis and change. One developed on the Davis campus funded from foundation support and the other at the Office of the President using university opportunity funds which were later supplanted by funds from the legislature.

The former is known as the Public Service Research and Dissemination Program (PSR&DP). It targets involvement of faculty primarily from Davis, the campus closest to the capital. It uses a mechanism of a directed call for research proposals focused on important long range legislative agenda items which require the expertise of the campus faculty. Projects are proposed, peer reviewed by a committee of faculty and outsiders and funded in collaboration with outside agencies or community groups. These agencies benefit from the collaborative effort and often implement the necessary processes for legislation or toward regulation. This collaborative process often frees the faculty from the difficulties of becoming directly involved with implementation of findings because agencies use the findings directly.

The other, the California Policy Seminar, maintains a systemwide call for research proposals to all faculty to propose research which has policy implications. These long term projects are proposed and accomplished in the traditional research mode, without agency involvement. The products of these projects are simply research reports which are made available to the public. In addition, legislators or their staffs may propose research topics needed to support policy planning. These more recent short term projects are beginning to drawing senior faculty into participation.

Though both programs seem similar, there are significant differences which will not be explored here. The fact is that both programs provide conferences, seminars and publications which help establish and cultivate linkages between the policy formulation process and researchers who can provide research findings to inform legislative and agency staffs in the preparation of legislation. These programs have expanded the role of the university in making significant contributions to the scientific, technical and socioeconomic planning of the state.

Characteristics of Faculty Who Participate in Public Service

The two special programs which address public policy research were used as a data base of faculty who have been motivated to become involved with public service in the last ten years. Table 2 shows the number of participants in collaborative research projects supported by PSR&DP indicating colleges and the different faculty ranks. There is a

TABLE 2

PUBLIC SERVICE RESEARCH AND DISSEMINATION PROGRAM

	L & S	Ag & ES	Eng.	Adm.	Law	Med.	Totals
Asst. Prof.	1	4				3	8
Assoc. Prof.	4	10				1	15
Professors	2	18	2	1	1	4	28
CX Spec. Other		2					2
	7	34	2	1	1	8	53
% of those who participated	13%	59.2%		7.4%		14.8%	
% of faculty of college who participated	1.5%	7.4%		6.3%		2%	

relatively high participation of all members of the professional schools (8.3%) and the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences (7.4%) as compared to Letters and Science. The actual number of faculty participants is small due to many factors among them: the limitations imposed by the policy research focus, the awareness of the program by the faculty, the willingness to participate, the need for funds to accomplish the work. What is important is that some faculty are willing to spend time on policy issue research, that potential users of the information feel that the findings are helpful in policy formulation, that information is timely and that there is access to faculty resources. It is clear that only a small percentage of the total faculty will be involved at any one time.

The number of full professor participants lends credibility to their research endeavor, assists in the personnel review process and enhances the value of public service. Students involved in the research projects use the findings as whole or part os theses or dissertations. They also begin to form a new generation of later collaborators.

Faculty of the professional schools and the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences integrate applied research in the process of theory building and appreciate many of the implications of applied research for their teaching and research. The land grant tradition of involvement in agricultural development is an asset in cultivating a more comprehensive public service program.

A recent follow up survey of participants in PSR&DP indicates that most faculty have continued to research facets of the same topic but have been awarded grants or contracts. The most frequent sources have been the previous collaborating agency or another university program. Some curricular changes have occurred as a result of participation, students have been involve in the research and several new research areas have emerged for individuals and in some departments.

Table 3 shows the participation of faculty and staff from all campuses who have been involved since 1979 in the California Policy Seminar. Some projects reflect several investigators. The spread across ranks and colleges is not significantly different from the previous data. However the latest data on short term projects shows a marked increase in participation of senior faculty as well as a significant involvement of other professional researchers from Cooperative Extension and organized research units.

These data indicate that there is a high proportion of professional school faculty representation (8.9%) compared it their actual number among all faculty. Policy oriented research is closer to the interest of such persons, they understand how to bridge the academic and the real world gap while successfully achieving their own goals of academic survival.

The data here presented only reflect two relatively small special programs at the University. Both of these programs provide linkages between the legislative staff and the faculty, especially acting as access

TABLE 3

CALIFORNIA POLICY SEMINAR
1979-85

Long term research projects, ALL CAMPUSES

	L & S	Ag	Adm/Ed/Law	Health	Totals
Asst. Professor	2	1	4	6	13
Assoc. Professor	4	5	4	5	18
Professor	6	1	3	7	17
Other Professional	6	3	2	6	17

Short term projects/requests from Legislative Research offices

1984-86	L & S	Ag	Adm/Ed/Law/S.W.	Health	Eng.	Totals	
Asst. Professor	1					1	2
Assoc. Professor	1	3			1	1	6
Professor	5	4	4		3	3	19
Other Professional	10	6	4		6	1	27
Total Faculty	19	14	15		22	5	
% of faculty of Colleges	.57%	1.4%	5.1%		1.1%	2.7%	

points to the complex organizations of each world. The participation which has been studied is limited to those who undertook research projects. It is almost impossible to have current information on the participation of faculty in other public service efforts (consultations, conferences, hearings etc.) because there is no direct reporting mechanism.

Faculty Attitudes Toward Public Policy Involvement

In 1977, Paul Sabatier, Professor of Environmental Studies was commissioned by the Public Service Research and Dissemination Program to undertake a study of the attitudes of faculty at UC Davis, toward participation in advising in policy related issues where their expertise could be used to help legislators. Data on faculty experience in advising, consulting, and providing expert witness was gathered probably for the first time. He assumed that the faculty was typical of many American state universities (except that it is very close to the capital.) In his report, The Sacramento Connection: Linking the Legislature with the University, he establishes both the legislature's perception of the value of academic research in the policy process as well as the faculty perception of the role and worth of academic contribution to policy formulation. His findings enlighten the discussion of why faculty are motivated to participate in public service.

Table 4 shows the interest of faculty of different colleges in participating in unpaid government advising. The highest interest is

TABLE 4

FUTURE INTEREST AND PAST EXPERIENCE IN UNPAID ADVISING WITH GOVERNMENTAL BODIES BY SCHOOL/DISCIPLINE

(n=818)

	School/Discipline												
	Letters and Sciences				Agriculture and Envir. Sciences				Professional Schools				
Degree of Future Interest	Natural Sciences (n=112)	Social Sciences (n=72)	Humanities (n=67)	Total (n=251)	Agricul. (n=219)	Envir. Sci. (n=32)	Econ./ Behav. (n=33)	Total (n=284)	Engin. (n=45)	Law (n=17)	Medicine (n=145)	Vet. Med. (n=73)	Total (n=280)
Definitely Interested	19%	25%	18%	21%	29%	38%	39%	31%	34%	41%	37%	20%	32%
Probably Interested	25%	21%	20%	23%	29%	41%	29%	30%	23%	18%	27%	30%	26%
Doubtful	40%	42%	29%	39%	34%	19%	32%	33%	34%	35%	34%	38%	35%
Not at All Interested/Irrelevant	16%	11%	32%	18%	8%	3%	0%	6%	9%	6%	2%	13%	6%
TOTAL	100%	99%	99%	101%	100%	101%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Cramer's V = .14, Sig. =.000													
Extent of Advising Experience In Last Two Years													
1-9 days	12%	16%	6%	12%	19%	25%	18%	19%	4%	6%	17%	8%	12%
10-19 days	3%	4%	3%	3%	7%	12%	15%	9%	7%	6%	6%	8%	7%
20 or more days	5%	15%	4%	8%	10%	28%	15%	12%	11%	29%	10%	7%	10%
Subtotal with some experience	20%	35%	13%	23%	36%	65%	48%	40%	22%	41%	33%	23%	29%
No experience	80%	65%	87%	78%	64%	34%	52%	60%	78%	59%	67%	77%	71%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%	101%	100%	99%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Cramer's V = .15, Sig. =.000													

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

expressed by the College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences followed by the professional schools taken together. The highest percent with experience in advising is recorded in the college of agriculture, (50%) followed closely by the Law School (41%). Table 5 shows that more than half the faculty of each rank indicated an interest in future involvement. Untenured faculty are slightly less likely to have had experience, no doubt due to their shorter time on campus and therefore less knowledge of persons in government. Yet this group indicates a willingness to be included. The extent of past experience seemed to be the most important factor in predicting future interest.

Based on their experience the reasons faculty indicated are the important incentives for advising included from most to least important:

Efficient utilization of their time

Utilization of advice in a professional manner

Relevance of their expertise to policy in question

Intellectual stimulation

Influence on policy decisions

Additional publications and grants

Notification of contribution in personnel file

Monetary reimbursement

Enhanced professional prestige

Association with well known officials

These factors can be considered indicators of motivation for faculty involvement in advising and consulting. The most important incentives have nothing to do with professional or career advancement.

TABLE 5

FUTURE INTEREST AND PAST EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SERVICE ADVISING BY RANK

Professor Degree of Future Interest	Assistant Professor (n=217)	Associate Professor (n=176)	Full (n=377)
Definitely Interested	23%	28%	30%
Probably Interested	27%	26%	27%
Doubtful	43%	34%	31%
Not at All Interested	6%	13%	12%
	99%	101%	100%

Cramer's V = .11; significance = .05

Extent of Experience in Informal Advising During Past Two Years			
1- 9 days	12%	11%	18%
10-19 days	4%	6%	8%
20 or more days	7%	11%	10%
Subtotal	23%	28%	36%
No days	77%	72%	64%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Cramer's V = .11; significance .04

In addition to experience in policy matters and rank other factors which might influence one's participation in public service could be based on one's perception of the role of the university in society and the role of policy research in the university. A series of questions were designed to elicit responses to address these issues.

The first half of Table 6 indicates that 60 percent of the faculty feel that they and the university have a duty to make their expertise available to public policy makers. There is also expressed concern for the unique role of the university in fostering basic knowledge and the potential for "no win" situations. The level of agreement among faculty on the potential academic contribution to lawmakers was a surprise. Faculty rank and college did not change the responses significantly. In addition, the expressed responsibility of faculty to alert lawmakers to the implications their research may have on policy was astonishingly high. The supportive climate for policy involvement which emerged from this report is indicative of the willing participation of faculty in Public Service Research at our campus.

Sabatier also studied the participation of faculty in preparation of 108 bills in the legislature in 1977. He found that 30 faculty had been involved in 22 bills and 35 percent were reasonably satisfied while 47 percent were very satisfied with the experience. He concluded that most participation was by request of a governmental official to provide expert information, and that this was based on expertise.

TABLE 6

Scales Indicating Different Conceptions of the Proper Role of the University (n = 818)

Items (factor loading in parenthesis)	*Distribution of Opinion (in percentages)* *Agree*	*Ambivalent*	*Disagree*
A. Duty to Assist Policy Makers Scale			
1. Faculty members have a duty to contribute their knowledge and experience to the resolution of policy problems (r = .63).	61	21	19
2. As a public institution supported by the taxpayers of this state, the University of California should encourage its faculty to address themselves to the resolution of public problems (r = .60).	70	18	12
3. University faculty have a responsibility to assess the potential societal implications of their research and to communicate the probable consequences to government decision makers (r = .58).	69	17	14
4. In filling its next faculty vacancy, my department should take an interest in policy-oriented research and/or a concern with the policy implications of research an important part of the position description (r = .56).	17	19	64
5. The public service commitments of the University should essentially be limited to the training of students (some of whom will eventually work for governmental agencies or get involved in public affairs) and the search for basic knowledge (r = - .46).	20	11	69
B Traditionalist Scale			
1. Universities are virtually the only social institutions charged with the expansion of basic knowledge, and thus a much higher priority should be accorded basic research than policy oriented research – even if one assumes that the latter can be as intellectually demanding (r = .66).	44	18	38
2. Policy oriented research generally involves greater loss of independence in choosing research topics, methods of inquiry, and dissemination of results than does basic research (r = .52).	64	19	16
3. Basic research almost always demands more intellectual creativity and analytical rigor than policy-oriented research (r = .50).	26	17	57
4. The integrity of the University as a detached critic of society is compromised by close contact with government institutions (r = .45)	27	24	49

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is not intended that generalization can necessarily be drawn from the data gathered. It does indicate that at least in the case examined the faculty were more willing to participate in the policy process than had been previously indicated in other studies.

Two studies, one on the research efforts and the other on advising, indicate that programs which will involve faculty in responsive participation must be based on intimate knowledge of faculty expertise, as well as how both university and outside organizations work. Some of the important elements include the reward systems for both parties, the time frame differences, the contributions which each can make to the other and the limits of expectations. Faculty expressed a perceived duty to assist the legislature in their area of expertise, but indicated concern for the effective use of their time and the use of their advice by government agencies in a professional manner. Indeed, faculty also noted that even if they were interested in public service, they were unsure of how to be effective in the process. Programs such as the two discussed here can provide some of the liaison function which both facilitates connections to experts as well as supports faculty efforts as necessary. The esprit de corp of the university which encourages good working relations with the state government will find ways to involve the faculty in participation as needed.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that a supportive institutional structure which provides linkage with the policy process is at least helpful to facilitate faculty interaction. Non-punitive factors in the reward system give freedom for faculty to venture into new areas. Peer review of proposals which are funded adds to the credibility of the work undertaken and increases the potential for success.

It seems clear that the institution benefits by improved public image and awareness of public policy issues. Individual faculty benefit from stimulating contacts and application to practical problems. The curriculum and the students can also benefit from new applications of theory as applied to current issues.

Cautions which are helpful include providing guidance to the faculty in areas where they do not have expertise, providing a supportive program to assist in difficult situations, especially in areas which are already highly politicized. It is important to involve the best faculty so that role models of success can guide the novices.

Bibliography

Bulmer, Martin. *The Uses of Social Science Research*. George Allen and Unwin, Boston, 1982.

California Policy Seminar. *Annual Report 1983-84*. Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California, Berkeley, 30 pp.

Dowling, Noreen, and Dana Abell. *The University and Public Policy: New Models for Communication, Action and Change*. Final report to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, 1976-1985. Public Service Research and Dissemination Program, July 1986.

Dowling, Noreen, and Diane Stumbo. "New Models for University Public Service Research: A Viable Experiment". *Educational Record*. Fall 1982, pp. 40-45.

Elman, Sandra E., and Sue Marx Smock. *Professional Service and Faculty Rewards*. Division of Urban Affairs, NASULGC, 1985.

Ikenberry, Stanley O., and Renee C. Friedman. *Beyond Academic Departments*. Jossey Bass, San Francisco, 1972.

Peason, Peter, and John Rowan. *Human Inquiry*. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1981.

Sabatier, Paul S. *Faculty Interest in Policy-Oriented Advising and Research Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization*. Vol. 5, No. 4, June 1984, pp. 469-502.

Sabatier, Paul. *The Sacramento Connection: Linking the Legislature with the University*. Kellogg Public Service Research Program and Institute of Governmental Affairs, University of California, Davis, June 1978, 95 pp.

Teich, Albert H., ed. *Scientists and Public Affairs*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1974.

Teich, Albert H. *Trends in the Organization of Academic Research*. University of San Francisco Report.

University of California. 1978. *Handbook for Faculty Members of the University of California*.

_____. 1985. *Why Public Service: A Guide for Faculty at the University of California, Davis*. Committee on Public Service--Davis Academic Senate and Public Service Research and Dissemination Program, 33 pp.